

REMARKS

Entry of this response is respectfully requested.

Claims 60-64 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hanada, alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Hanada. Claims 65-66 and 68-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Hanada in view of Qiu. Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections.

Claims 60-69, as amended, relate to a method of providing a permanent oil-or water-repellent surface or modification of mineral carriers by applying a polyurethane resin modified according to the invention onto a mineral carrier.

Hanada discloses artificial leather coated with a composition which is a reaction product of a fluorine-containing diol (corresponding to component (A1) of the present application), a butanediol curative (corresponding to component (D)) an isocyanate component (corresponding to component (B1)) and catalysts and solvents, respectively.

Hanada further relates to accordingly treated artificial leather.

To sustain an anticipation rejection, every limitation of a claim needs to be disclosed in the cited reference. Hanada does not provide any teaching to one of skill in the art as to the treatment of a mineral carrier material. Thus, the claims, as amended, are not anticipated by Hanada.

Moreover, the Examiner argued that Hanada discloses surfaces other than artificial leather, such as wall paper, furniture, which read on non-mineral substrates. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 61-69, as amended, do not recite the limitation of “non-mineral substrate” in the first place. Thus, the Examiner’s argument does not apply to the presently pending claims.

In addition, the Examiner mis-interpreted the cited reference. As stated in paragraph 53, Hanada merely cited clothing, furniture, wall paper, etc. to illustrate potential uses of artificial leather and the corresponding surface always consists of coated artificial leather. *See* paragraph 53 of Hanada, “Artificial leather according to the present invention, which can be obtained as described above, has excellent stain resistance, waterproofness, abrasion resistance and non-tackiness, and therefore, can be used for the production of clothing, sportswear, furniture, wall paper, cars, shoes, sports shoes, gloves, tents, sheets, footwear, miscellaneous goods, and the like.” Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner’s argument is untenable.

Furthermore, a person of skill in the art of construction chemistry, in particular, a skilled person intending to provide the antigraffiti coatings, would not have relied on knowledge concerning the field of clothing or textile industry such as artificial leather industry to achieve anti-graffiti coatings for, e.g., buildings.

Thus, the present claims are not rendered obvious by Hanada alone, or by a combination of Hanada with Qiu. (U.S. 2003/0026997).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-0624, under Order No. HUBR-1288-US.

Respectfully submitted

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

By /James R. Crawford/
James R. Crawford
Reg. No. 39,155

666 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10103
(212) 318-3000